



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,880	02/03/2004	Srinivas Sreemanthula	863.0007.U1(US)	1057
29683	7590	07/19/2010	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH 4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202 SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			SAMUEL, DEWANDA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2464	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2010 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/770,880

Applicant(s)

SREEMANTHULA ET AL.

Examiner

DEWANDA SAMUEL

Art Unit

2464

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 31-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 16 and 31-59 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the communication filed on 02/22/2010.

Claims 1-16, 31-59 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16, 31-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. D

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1,4,12-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibanez (PG PUB 2003/0026230) in view of Admitted Prior Art (Instant Application) and in further view of Ernst ("Network Mobility Support Terminology", 2002).

With regard to claim 1, Ibanez teaches a method comprising: sending a request for information relating to a plurality of link addresses to a link address manager of an access network (AN). (**Ibanez et al. disclose having a SGSN 26 sending a request to a GPRS support node (GGSN) 28 interpreted as a link address**

manager” within a GPRS system 10 interpreted as a “access network” which generates link-local addresses, see page 3 para[0027]).

However, Ibanez et al. do not disclose where the request is sent by a gateway mobile terminal of a mobile network (MONET), (**Admitted prior art discloses MR 3 sends a prefix scope binding update message interpreted a “request” , see page 3 lines 20-23**) ; receiving a response to the request; and allocating, based on the response, individual ones of assigned link addresses to individual ones of network nodes of the MONET, (**Admitted prior art discloses gateway device performing address management for all MNNs 7 within the MONET 1, see page 5 lines 14-18).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the functionality of the mobile router which taught by Admitted prior art into Ibanez et al. communication system efficiently providing mobility for mobile device.

However, the combination of Ibanez et al. and Admitted Prior Art do not disclose a mobile network that further comprises at least one mobile network node, where the gateway mobile terminal is coupled between the at least one mobile network node and an access point of the access network. **Ernst et al. disclose having a MONET comprise of a mobile network node, a mobile router interpreted as a “gateway mobile terminal” coupled between a mobile network node and a access router**

interpreted as " access point" of the Internet interpreted as a " access network" (see page 5 fig.1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate MONET which is taught by Ernst et al. into Ibanez communication system whereby efficiently providing continuous Internet connectively. One will at the motivation have continuous connectivity of the Internet among mobile network node , access router and a mobile router whereby providing reliable throughput during mobility.

With regard to claim 4, Ibanez et al. further teach the request is made to obtain a set of link layer addresses (LLAs) that are allocated to individual ones of the network nodes, **(see fig. 2 , PDP context request message 56 from a MS via SGSN 26).**

With regard to claim 12, However, Ibanez does not explicitly discloses where said gateway mobile terminal comprises a wireless device. **(Admitted prior art discloses having a MR 3 which defined as mobile phone interpreted as a "wireless device" , see page 2 lines 13-25).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate wireless devices which is taught by Admitted prior art into Ibanez communication system efficiently providing mobile

communication within a communication system.

With regard to claim 13, However , Ibanez does not explicitly discloses where said gateway mobile terminal comprises a cellular telephone, (**Admitted prior art discloses having a MR 3 which defined as mobile phone, see page 2 lines 13-25).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate wireless devices which is taught by Admitted prior art into Ibanez communication system efficiently providing mobile communication within a communication system.

With regard to claim 14, However , Ibanez does not explicitly discloses said gateway mobile terminal comprises a mobile router (MR), (**Admitted prior art discloses having a mobile router , see fig. 1).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate wireless devices which is taught by Admitted prior art into Ibanez communication system efficiently providing mobile communication within a communication system.

With regard to claim 15, However , Ibanez does not explicitly discloses said link address manager is associated with said AN, (**Admitted prior art discloses AN 4 is**

connected to a gateway device which manages LLA, see page 5 lines 14-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate wireless devices which is taught by Admitted prior art into Ibanez communication system efficiently providing mobile communication within a communication system.

5. **Claim 5 and 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibanez et al. (PG PUB 2003/0026230) and Admitted Prior Art (Instant Application) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shitama (PG PUB 2002/0126642).

With regard to claim 5, However , Ibanez does not explicitly discloses, where the request is made to obtain a group identification where the method further comprises using an obtained group identification to formulate a set of link layer addresses (LLAs) that are allocated to individual ones of the network nodes, **(Shitama discloses having domain comprised of plurality of subnetworks, see Abstract. Shitama further discloses terminal device belonging to the same subnetwork have an IPv6 address interpreted as “LLA” contains the same network prefix interpreted as a " group", see page 5 para[0085]).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate subnetwork addressing scheme which is

taught by Shitama et al. into Ibanez et al. communication system whereby improving addressing and communication processing for a mobile communication device.

With regard to claim 11, in combination Ibanez et al. and teaches the method recited in claim 4. where the set of LLAs is tracked as a group, **(Shitama discloses having domain comprised of plurality of subnetworks, see Abstract. Shitama further discloses terminal device belonging to the same subnetwork have an IPv6 address interpreted as "LLA" contains the same network prefix interpreted as a " group", see page 5 para[0085]).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate subnetwork addressing scheme which is taught by Shitama et al. into Ibanez et al. communication system whereby improving addressing and communication processing for a mobile communication device.

6. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibanez et al. (PG PUB 2003/0026230) and Admitted Prior Art (Instant Application) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Khalil et al. (US Patent 7,342,914).

With regard to claim 6 and 7, in combination Ibanez et al. and teaches the method recited in claim 1. where the request is made to obtain a set of link layer addresses

(LLAs), (**Ibanez et al. discloses having a SGSN 26 sending a request to a GPRS support node (GGSN) 28 interpreted as a link address manager” within a GPRS system 10 interpreted as a “access network” which generates link-local addresses, see page 3 para[0027]**). However , Ibanez does not explicitly discloses where the method further comprises mapping individual ones of the LLAs to individual hardwired addresses of individual ones of the network nodes, (**Khalil et al. discloses associating a link layer address 410 with a MAC address 440, see col. 8 lines 7-15).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate an address association scheme which is taught by Khalil et al. into Ibanez communication system providing an efficiently addressing scheme whereby increasing IP mobility during routing.

7. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibanez et al. (PG PUB 2003/0026230) and Admitted Prior Art (Instant Application) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Chiou (US Patent 6,473,413).

With regard to claim 8, However , Ibanez does not explicitly discloses where the set of LLAs are associated with a first access point , the method further comprising, in response to changing a connection of the gateway mobile terminal from the first access point to a second access point , sending a message from the gateway mobile terminal

to reassociate the set of LLAs with the second access point , **(Chiou et al. discloses having a method for inter-IP- domain roaming across wireless networks (title). Chiou et al. further discloses having a MAC address (LLA) associated with an AP (access point). Chiou et al. discloses that a mobile station 19 moves from first access point A 13 to the new access point B 17 (column 3 line 59-67 and column 4 line 1- 21) with a reassociation procedure between the AP 17 and mobile station 19).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement a mobile station reassociating APs (access point) as taught by Chiou et al. into a Ibanez communication system to providing a mechanism to allow to roam among various access points in different IP subnets.

8. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibanez et al. (PG PUB 2003/0026230) and Admitted Prior Art (Instant Application) and Shitama (PG PUB 2002/0126642) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Chiou (US Patent 6,473,413).

With regard to claim 9, However, Ibanez does not explicitly discloses where the group identification is associated with a first AP, the method further comprising, in response to changing a connection of the Gateway mobile terminal from the first access point to a

second access point , sending a message from the gateway mobile terminal to reassociate the group identification with the second AP, **(Chiou et al. discloses having a method for inter-IP- domain roaming across wireless networks (title). Chiou et al. further discloses having a MAC address (LLA) associated with an AP (access point). Chiou et al. discloses that a mobile station 19 moves from first access point A 13 to the new access point B 17 (column 3 line 59-67 and column 4 line 1- 21) with a reassociation procedure between the AP 17 and mobile station 19).**

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement a mobile station reassociating APs (access point) as taught by Chiou et al. into a Ibanez communication system to providing a mechanism to allow to roam among various access points in different IP subnets.

With regard to claim 10, However, Ibanez does not explicitly discloses where the group identification is associated with a first access point, the method further comprising, in response to changing a connection of the gateway mobile terminal from the first access point to a second access point , sending a message from the gateway mobile terminal to obtain another group identification that is associated with the second access point,

(Chiou et al. discloses having a method for inter-IP- domain roaming across wireless networks (title). Chiou et al. further discloses having a MAC address (LLA) associated with an AP (access point). Chiou et al. discloses that a mobile station 19 moves from first access point A 13 to the new access point B 17 (column 3 line 59-67 and column 4 line 1- 21) with a reassociation procedure between the AP 17 and mobile station 19).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement a mobile station reassociating APs (access point) as taught by Chiou et al. into a Ibanez communication system to providing a mechanism to allow to roam among various access points in different IP subnets.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 16 and 31-59 are allowable over prior art.
10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEWANDA SAMUEL whose telephone number is (571)270-1213. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday 8:30-5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Q. Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ricky Ngo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2464

/DeWanda Samuel/
Examiner, Art Unit 2464
7/17/2010